

Docket No.: BRXIUS-3
Appl. No.: 10/667,147

REMARKS

The last Office Action of June 2, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 13 have been amended. Claims 3, 4 have been canceled. No amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

It is noted that the drawings are objected to because of applicant's failure to show every feature set forth in the claims. The objection to the drawings is respectfully traversed because the distance between the flanges in the end position is shown in Fig. 4, although not expressly labeled. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawing is thus respectfully requested.

It is further noted that claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 are objected because of some informalities.

Claims 1, 2 and 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,062,816 to Chang.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,217,248 to Reiff.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiff in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,645,365 to Malish.

Applicant has amended claim 1 by incorporating the subject matter of claims 3 and 4. In drafting claim 1, great care has been taken to address the

Docket No.: BRXIUS-3
Appl. No.: 10/667,147

claim objection to claim 3. Claims 2, 12 and 13 have also been amended, as suggested by the Examiner.

As a result of the incorporation of the subject matter of claim 4 into claim 1, the §102(b) rejection of claims on the basis of Chang or Reiff becomes moot.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of original claim 4, now incorporated in claim 1, on the basis of the combination of Reiff and Malish for the following reasons:

Claim 1, now on file, is directed to an apparatus having a bayonet coupling with a bayonet element that has a stem portion and a head portion, wherein the head portion has a slanted underside in the turning direction. This configuration is shown in Fig. 7, and reference is also made to paragraph [0034] of the instant specification. As a result, a relative rotation of the connector elements draws the connector elements toward one another in axial direction.

As noted by the Examiner, Reiff fails to disclose a bayonet coupling with a head portion having a slanted underside in direction of turning, but applies here the Malish reference. Malish discloses a floor maintenance machine having a drive member (24) provided with an integral drive hub (27) which includes integral, radially extending drive lugs (28). As described in col. 4, lines 29, the lugs may have rounded corners (25). The Examiner interprets these corners as a slanted underside of a head portion. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As set forth in claim 1, the head portion has an underside (not a corner!) which is slanted and which constitutes an active part to effect a movement of the connector elements

Docket No.: BRXIU3-3
Appl. No.: 10/667,147

toward one another in axial direction. The rounded corners in Malish do not contribute anything to the interaction between the lugs and the respective ramp surfaces. The Malish disclosure is silent as to the purpose of the rounded corners. At best, the rounding of the corners may be interpreted as a means to prevent a tilting of the lugs, when the lugs engage the flat ramp surfaces (65). In addition, the rounded corners extend in radial direction (col. 4, line 24) and not in rotation direction.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither Reiff nor Malish, nor a combination thereof teaches or suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claim 1.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the

Docket No.: BRIXIUS-3
Appl. No.: 10/667,147

Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: August 31, 2005
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:af